



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,584	07/07/2003	Frank Gordon Krausz	10547.26US2	7595
34018	7590	10/09/2007	EXAMINER	
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP			HUYNH, CONG LAC T	
77 WEST WACKER DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 2500			2178	
CHICAGO, IL 60601-1732				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/09/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Art Unit: 2178



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

MAILED

OCT 09 2007

Technology Center 2100

Application Number: 10/614,584
Filing Date: July 07, 2003
Appellant(s): KRAUSZ ET AL.

Gary R. Jarosik
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Art Unit: 2178

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 6/12/07 appealing from the Office action mailed 7/21/06 and in response to the return from the Board of Appeal regarding the missing of the two references used in the Ground of Rejections but not listed under the Evidence Relied Upon section.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

20030074271	VISWANATH et al.	4-2003
20050273722	MATSAKIS et al.	12-2005
20020129006	EMMETT et al.	9-2002
20030233321	SCOLINI et al.	12-2002

Peat et al., *Introducing XML/EDI ... "the e-Business framework"*, August 1997, pages 1-19.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

A. Claims 14-16, 18, 20-21 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath et al. (US Pat App Pub No 2003/0074271, 4/17/03, filed 10/17/01) in view of Matsakis et al. (US Pat App Pub No 2005/0273772, 12/8/05, priority 12/21/99) and Peat et al., *Introducing XML/EDI... "the e-Business framework"*, August 1997, IDS.

Regarding independent claim 14, Viswanath discloses:

- using a graphical user interface to create a file including tags (figure 2, [0049]-[0058]: via the interface, XML files with tags are created for business purpose in purchasing system that allows users to perform typical customization)

Art Unit: 2178

- including XML tags for selecting data for inclusion in the purchase order ([0016]-[0017],[0019]) and specifying a layout for the purchase order including the selected data ([0018], [0021], [0084]-[0086])
- accessing a database of a service provider to collect data according to the tags for using the collected data and generating a purchase output file ([0016]-[0021])
- providing the purchase output file to an output device which uses the purchase output file to generate the purchase order where the data for the purchase order is fetched in response to the user's request and the format is formed suitable for delivery in response to the particular purchase order ([0018], [0021])

Viswanath does not disclose that the xml document is an invoice.

Matsakis discloses using XML format for business documents such as invoices and purchase orders ([0012]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Matsakis into Viswanath for generating an invoice using the same method as in Viswanath since invoices or purchase orders are business documents including specific data related to invoices or purchase orders. Thus, by analogy, an invoice can be generated using Viswanath method with XML tags and specific data related to an invoice.

Viswanath and Matsakis do not disclose that the tags used for the purchase order or the invoice are the IML tags of the Invoice Markup Language.

Peat addresses that it is surprisingly simple that one can define one's own markup language with XML (page 10).

Art Unit: 2178

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill at the time of the invention was made to have combined Peat into Matsakis and Viswanath for the following reason. Matsakis discloses using XML for encoding business documents such as invoices and purchase orders providing the advantage to incorporate into Viswanath method for generating an invoice using XML with specific data relating to invoices as desired instead of data relating to purchase orders.

Further, since defining a particular markup language based on XML for a specific purpose is possible according to Peat, it appears that XML, when applied for generating an invoice, would produce an invoice markup language with specific tags relating to invoice characteristics.

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, Viswanath disclose that the purchase order output file comprises an HTML file [0024].

Matsakis discloses using XML format for business documents such as invoices and purchase orders ([0012]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Matsakis into Viswanath for outputting an invoice file using the same method as in Viswanath since invoices or purchase orders are business documents including specific data related to invoices or purchase orders. Thus, by analogy, an invoice can be generated using Viswanath method with XML tags and specific data related to an invoice.

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Viswanath discloses transmitting the output file via a network to the output device ([0012], [0017]).

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 16, Viswanath discloses that the output device comprises a personal computer ([0014], [0015], [0060]).

Claims 20-21 are for a system for performing method claims 14 and 15, and are rejected under the same rationale.

B. Claim 17 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath in view of Matsakis and Peat as applied in claim 16 above, and further in view of Emmett et al. (US Pat App Pub No 2002/0129006 A1, 9/12/02, filed 2/14/02, priority 2/16/01).

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, Viswanath, Matsakis, and Peat do not disclose that the output device comprises a hand-held processing device.

Emmett discloses that handheld devices including Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs) and cellular telephones offer connectivity to the Internet and permit access to documents available over the Internet ([0005]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Emmett into Viswanath, Matsakis, and Peat since Emmett discloses that a handheld device can access to a document available on the Internet

Art Unit: 2178

providing the advantage to incorporate into Viswanath, Matsakis, and Peat for having a handheld device as a convenient output device, since a user can carry it with him or her anywhere, for accessing an online invoice, a form of Internet document.

C. Claims 19 and 22 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath, Matsakis, and Peat as applied in claim 16 above, and further in view of Scolini et al. (US Pat App Pub No 2003/0233321 A1, 12/18/03, filed 10/30/02, priority 11/30/01).

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent on claim 14, Viswanath, Matsakis, and Peat do not disclose that the invoice output file comprises a printer-control language file. Scolini discloses that the invoice or customer bill is converted into AFP format as the output file ([0842], [0980]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Scolini into Viswanath, Matsakis, and Peat since the AFP form, which is a printer-control language file, of the invoice in Scolini provides the advantage to incorporate into the invoice in Viswanath, Matsakis, and Peat for rapidly printing the invoice document at a printer site.

Claim 22 is for a system for performing method claim 19, and is rejected under the same rationale.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant argues that Viswanath fails to disclose, teach or suggest generating an invoice and an invoice markup language (IML) as claimed. Appellant further argue that "More particularly, each of Viswanath, Matsakis, and Peat fails to disclose, teach or suggest providing a graphical user interface tool to create a file (whether IML or otherwise) that includes a first set of tags (whether IML or otherwise) defined by a document type definition that are used to select data for inclusion in a document (whether an invoice or otherwise) and a second set of tags (whether IML or otherwise) defined by the document type definition that are used to specify both a page style for the document and how to display the selected data within the document" (Brief, page 5).

Examiner agrees that Viswanath fails to disclose or teach generating an invoice and an invoice markup language (IML) as claimed. However, as addressed in the final action, Viswanath discloses using XML for generating a purchase order ([0016]- [0019]), where business documents such as purchase order and invoice are generated using XML according to Matsakis ([0012]). It is also noted that it was well known that the purchasing process where the purchase order is generated for buying on the Internet as in Viswanath is carried out via a user graphical interface. Peat discloses that one can define their own markup language with XML (page 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Peat into Matsakis and Viswanath for defining an invoice markup language IML for generating an invoice, actually for selecting data to be included in the invoice as well as

Art Unit: 2178

displaying the selected data within the invoice for the following reason. Generating an invoice with XML would be carried out the same way as for generating a purchase order in XML as in Viswanath since both purchase order or invoice are business documents created in XML. Also, using XML to define a markup language such as an invoice markup language for generating an invoice with specific data selected to be included in the invoice is suggested according to Peat regarding using XML to define a markup language for a specific purpose.

In addition, it is noted that Matsakis shows that XML tags are defined by a document type definition ([0122], [0127], [0371]). Peat also mentions that XML tags are defined by a document type definition (page 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Viswanath, Matsakis, and Peat for the feature argued above.

Appellant also argue that no cited reference discloses, teaches, or suggests the claimed graphical user interface tool that is used to create a file that includes both a first set of tags defined by a document type definition that are used to select data for inclusion in a document and a second set of tags defined by the document type definition that are used to specify both a page style for a document and how to display the selected data within the document (brief, page 7).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Viswanath discloses *creating one file* with XML tags for selecting data to be included in a purchase order and for a style of the layout of the purchase order ([0054]-[0058]). In

Art Unit: 2178

addition, since Viswanath discloses using XML tags for selecting data to be included in a purchase order as well displaying of the purchase order, Viswanath, thus, implies that there are two different sets of tags in one file to control selecting data for the purchase order and to control displaying of the selected data for the purchase order.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



Cong-Lac Huynh
Primary Examiner
9/17/07

Conferees:



Stephen Hong
STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER



Doug Hutton
Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100